

**Remarks**

Applicants submit herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the present application.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical and grammatical errors. Accordingly, a Version with Markings to Show Changes Made to the specification is enclosed. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants have also amended FIGs. 7 and 11 to correct minor inadvertent errors. Accordingly, marked-up copies of FIGs. 7 and 11 with the corrections indicated in red are enclosed, along with copies of the amended figures. A Letter to the Official draftsman is also enclosed.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over DeLorme. Even though applicants totally disagree with the Examiner's position, to advance the prosecution of the application, applicants have canceled claims 1-38, without prejudice.

Claims 39-86 have been added, which are drawn to different aspects of the invention. DeLorme discloses a system for travel reservation and planning. However, nowhere does DeLorme teach or suggest the inventive concierge-type service, including, among others, "updating a status of fulfilment of the request" for the concierge-type service "based on the last action performed, and setting a time limit when the attempt" to fulfil the request "is unsuccessful ...," as new claim 39 recites. As such, claim 39, together with its dependent claims, is neither anticipated by nor made obvious over DeLorme.

In addition, nowhere does DeLorme teach or suggest "in response to the request" for the inventive concierge-type service, "identifying a provider of the selected goods or service based on data concerning preferences of the user in a stored record," and "selecting an agent to ... fulfil the request for the concierge-type service, the agent being selected based on a location of the agent relative to the location of the provider," as new claim 57 recites. As such, claim 57, together with its dependent claims, is neither anticipated by nor made obvious over DeLorme.

Serial No. 09/520,306

Moreover, nowhere does DeLorme teach or suggest “receiving by a switching unit a communication call ... including a request for a concierge-type service; determining by the switching unit an identifier [e.g., a telephone number] associated with a communication device of the user [e.g., a wireless telephone] from which the communication call originated;” and “automatically incorporating at least the identifier in [a] record in fulfilling the request,” as method claims 63 recites. System claim 75 tracks method claim 63 and includes similar limitations. As such, claims 63 and 75, together with their dependent claims, are neither anticipated by nor made obvious over DeLorme.

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 39-86, as added, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 10, 2002  
Enclosures

By:   
Alex L. Yip  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 34,759  
212-836-7363